arXiv:1607.02962v1 [math.PR] 11 Jul 2016

On the Ornstein-Zernike equation for stationary cluster processes and the random connection model

Günter Last* and Sebastian Ziesche†

July 12, 2016

Abstract

In the first part of this paper we consider a general stationary subcritical cluster model in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The associated pair-connectedness function can be defined in terms of two-point Palm probabilities of the underlying point process. Using Palm calculus and Fourier theory we solve the Ornstein-Zernike equation (OZE) under quite general distributional assumptions. In the second part of the paper we discuss the analytic and combinatorial properties of the OZE-solution in the special case of a Poisson driven random connection model.

Key words: Ornstein-Zernike equation, Gilbert graph, random connection model, pair-connectedness function, Poisson process, percolation, analyticity
MSC (2010): Primary: 60K35, 60D05; Secondary: 60G55

1 Introduction

In a seminal paper Ornstein and Zernike proposed in [12] to split the interaction between molecules in a liquid into a direct and an indirect part. While the resulting spatial convolution equation is of great important in physics, it seems to be hardly known among mathematicians. The aim of this paper is to bridge this gap and to lay a rigorous mathematical foundation for further studies.

We start with a simple example of a stationary cluster process, which is also a special case of the random connection model, studied later. Let η_t be a stationary Poisson process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity $t \geq 0$. Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a *gauge body*, that is a compact set containing the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in its interior. We define a *random geometric graph* $\mathcal{G}(\eta_t)$ with vertex set η_t as follows. Two distinct points $x, y \in \eta_t$ are adjacent in $\mathcal{G}(\eta_t)$ whenever $(B+x) \cap (B+y) \neq \emptyset$, where $B+x := \{x+z : z \in B\}$; see [14]. For $x \in \eta_t$ let $C(x, \eta_t) \subset \eta_t$ denote the *cluster* of x, that is the connected component of $\mathcal{G}(\eta_t)$ containing x. These definitions apply to any point process η, and in particular to deterministic locally finite

*Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, guenter.last@kit.edu
†Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, sebastian.ziesche@kit.edu

subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For each point process η on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\eta^x := \eta \cup \{x\}$ and $\eta^{x,y} := \eta \cup \{x, y\}$; see also the Appendix. We wish to study the *pair connectedness function* (see [16])

$$P_t(x, y) := \mathbb{P}(y \in C(x, \eta_t^{x,y})), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.1}$$

By Corollary 4.15 in [4], there is a *percolation threshold* $t_c \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|C(0, \eta_t^0)| = \infty) > 0$ for $t > t_c$ and $\mathbb{P}(|C(0, \eta_t^0)| = \infty) = 0$ for $t < t_c$. We seek a function $Q_t(x, y)$ solving the *Ornstein-Zernike equation*

$$P_t(x, y) = Q_t(x, y) + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q_t(x, z) P_t(z, y)\, dz, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ t < t_c. \tag{1.2}$$

We shall formulate and solve equation (1.2) in the following much more general setting. Let η be a stationary point process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite intensity γ_η. The points are partitioned into clusters (sets of points of η) according to a translation-invariant rule. This rule might be very general and can incorporate additional randomness (e.g. in the random connection model). The point process η is assumed to be jointly stationary with the cluster process. The pair-connectedness function $P(x, y)$ is then informally defined as the conditional probability that $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ belong to the same cluster, given that x and y are points of η (suitably weighted by the pair-correlation function). Then the Ornstein-Zernike equation (1.2) takes the form

$$P(x, y) = Q(x, y) + \gamma_\eta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(x, z) P(z, y)\, dz, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.3}$$

Our Theorem 2.1 shows under rather weak assumptions that equation (1.3) has a unique solution. The proof of this result is based on Palm calculus for stationary point processes (see the Appendix) and a classical theorem by Wiener on the inversion of Fourier transforms.

In Sections 3–5 of the paper we shall consider the (Poisson driven) random connection model (RCM) (see [9]), a significant generalization of the Gilbert graph introduced above. The RCM with parameters $t \geq 0$ and $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, 1]$ is a random graph $\mathcal{G}$ where the set of vertices is a Poisson process η_t with intensity t. Any two distinct vertices $x, y \in \eta_t$ are adjacent with probability $\varphi(x - y)$ independently of all other pairs and of η_t. We call φ the *connection function* of the RCM. The clusters in this model are just the connected components of $\mathcal{G}$. In Section 3 we shall give a detailed description of this model along with formulas on degree distributions (that are basically well-known) and a Margulis-Russo type formula. The latter result might be of some independent interest. In Section 4 we shall first show that the RCM satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, so that a solution $Q_t \equiv Q$ of (1.2) (with $P_t \equiv P$ denoting the pair connectedness function) exists in the whole subcritical regime. Then we prove that P_t is an analytic function of t on the interval $[0, t_*)$, where t_* is the smallest number such that for $t < t_*$ the typical cluster has an exponentially decreasing tail. In the Boolean model with fixed gauge body B (mentioned above), the arguments from [14] can be extended to show that t_* is equal to the percolation threshold t_c. In fact, Theorem 4.5 shows that this result holds for general integrable functions of the typical cluster. We then proceed with deriving similar properties for Q_t; see Proposition 4.10. We are not aware of a direct probabilistic

interpretation of Q_t. However, for small intensities t there is a simple combinatorial relationship between the coefficients in the expansions of P_t and Q_t; see Theorem 5.1.

In writing this paper we strongly benefited from the large physics literature on the topic. In particular the combinatorial formulas in the final section are basically well-known, although not in a mathematically rigorous form. Two key references are [1] and [2]. However, we have not been able to find a justification of the existence of solution of the OZE, even not in the very special case of the Poisson driven Boolean model. Moreover, the analytic properties of P_t and Q_t (often taken as granted) have not been proved either. In our opinion it is one of the main contributions of the present paper to apply modern point process methods (Palm calculus and Margulis-Russo type formulas for Poisson driven systems) to the OZE. The original motivation for our work came from [17], where the author uses the OZE to derive putative lower bounds for the percolation threshold in the Boolean model. This is one of the potential applications of the present paper.

2 The Ornstein-Zernike equation

In this section we establish equation (1.3) for general stationary cluster processes defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. As in the Appendix we assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ is equipped with a measurable flow $\{\theta_x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ leaving $\mathbb{P}$ invariant. We let η be an invariant (and therefore stationary) point process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with finite intensity $\gamma_\eta := \mathbb{E}\eta([0,1]^d)$. We also assume that $\mathbb{P}(\eta \neq \emptyset) = 1$. To describe the clusters, we consider a measurable mapping $(\omega, x) \mapsto \tau(\omega, x)$ from $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the covariance property

$$\tau(\theta_y \omega, x - y) = \tau(\omega, x) - y, \quad \omega \in \Omega,\ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.1}$$

(For convenience we also assume that $\tau(x) = x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, whenever $\eta(\mathbb{R}^d) = 0$.) The points of the random set

$$\xi := \{\tau(x) : x \in \eta\}$$

are interpreted as locations (or centers) of the clusters of η. Note that τ need not to be a deterministic function of η like in the Boolean model, but might incorporate additional randomness; see Section 3. The refined Campbell formula (6.4) and the covariance propert (2.1) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}|\xi \cap B| = \gamma_\eta \lambda_d(B)\, \mathbb{P}^0_\eta(\tau(0) \in B), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}^d,$$

where $|A|$ denotes cardinality of a set A, λ_d is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{P}^0_\eta$ is the Palm probability measure of η; see Appendix. In particular $\mathbb{E}|\xi \cap B| < \infty$ for all bounded Borel sets B, so that it is no restriction of generality to assume that ξ is locally finite everywhere on Ω. It follows that ξ is an invariant point process with finite intensity $\gamma_\xi = \gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{P}^0_\eta(\tau(0) \in [0,1]^d)$. The *clusters* can be formally defined as those points of η which have the same image under τ. Hence $x, y \in \eta$ belong to the same cluster iff $\tau(x) = \tau(y)$ and the cluster of $x \in \eta(\omega)$ is given by $C(\omega, x) := \{y \in \eta(\omega) : \tau(\omega, y) = \tau(\omega, x)\}$ or, more succinctly,

$$C(x) := \{y \in \eta : \tau(y) = \tau(x)\}, \quad x \in \eta. \tag{2.2}$$

(It is convenient to use this definition for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.) In the random connection model, for instance, the mapping τ is defined so as to make sure that (2.2) is consistent with the definition of the clusters given in the introduction.

It follows from (2.1) that

$$C(\theta_y\omega, x) = C(\omega, x+y) - y, \quad \omega \in \Omega,\, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.3}$$

The distribution of $C(0)$ under the Palm probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0$ (see Appendix) can be interpreted as the distribution of the cluster containing the typical point of η. We make the crucial assumption that the size of this cluster has a finite expectation, that is

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| < \infty, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\eta^0$ denotes the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0$. To retrieve the points in a cluster with location $z \in \xi(\omega)$ we define $D(\omega, z) := \{x \in \eta(\omega) : \tau(\omega, x) = z\}$ or,

$$D(z) := \{x \in \eta : \tau(x) = z\}, \quad z \in \xi. \tag{2.5}$$

(Again we use this notation for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$.)

As we are interested in second order properties of η, we need to assume that the second order factorial moment measure of η is locally finite and absolutely continuous. We then denote by ρ the pair correlation function and by $\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the bivariate Palm distributions of η. The latter are probability measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$; see Appendix. We can interpret $\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(A)$ as the conditional probability of $A \in \mathcal{A}$ given that η has points at x and y. Our interest in this paper focuses on the weighted *pair connectedness function*

$$P(x, y) := \rho(x-y)\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(y \in C(x)), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.6}$$

In view of (6.11) and (2.3) we have $P(x, y) = P(y - x)$ and we define the (even) function $P\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ by $P(x) := P(0, x)$. Choosing $f := \mathbf{1}\{0 \in C(x)\}$ in (6.10) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| = 1 + \gamma_\eta \int P(x)\, dx. \tag{2.7}$$

Hence (2.4) implies that P is in the space L^1 of all measurable functions $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\|f\|_1 := \int |f(x)|\, dx < \infty$.

The convolution of $f, g \in L^1$ is defined as

$$(f * g)(x) := \int f(x-y)g(y)\, dy, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In the same way we define the convolution for functions $f \in L^1$ and $g \in L^\infty$ where L^∞ is the space of bounded functions equipped with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Both definitions make sense due to the basic inequalities

$$\|f * g\|_\infty \le \|f\|_1 \|g\|_\infty, \quad f \in L^1, g \in L^\infty, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\|f * g\|_1 \le \|f\|_1 \|g\|_1, \quad f \in L^1, g \in L^\infty. \tag{2.9}$$

We can now formulate and prove the Ornstein-Zernike equation (1.2) in the present very general stationary setting. We need the regularity assumption

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^0\Big(\sum_{x \in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \neq 0 \Big) > 0, \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.10}$$

where wx is the Euclidean scalar product of $x, w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{i}$ is the imaginary unit.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that* (2.4) *and* (2.10) *hold. Then there is a unique* $Q \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$ *such that*

$$P = Q + \gamma_\eta Q * P. \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.2. Assumption (2.10) is rather weak. It holds, for instance, if $\mathbb{P}^0_\eta(|C(0)| = 1) > 0$. Indeed, if $|C(0)| = 1$, then the sum in (2.10) reduces to the single term 1. Another sufficient condition can be formulated in terms of the factorial moment measures $\alpha^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of η defined by (6.7). If these measures are locally finite and absolutely continuous, then

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\eta\Big(\sum_{x\in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} = 0\Big) = 0, \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

so that (2.10) holds. To see this, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}^0_\eta\Big(\sum_{x\in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} = 0\Big) &\le \mathbb{E}\sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta}^{\neq} \mathbf{1}\{e^{-\mathbf{i}wx_1} f_n(x_2,\dots,x_n) = 1\} \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n!}\mathbb{E}\int \mathbf{1}\{f_n(x_2,\dots,x_n) = e^{\mathbf{i}wx_1}\}\, \alpha^{(n)}(d(x_1,\dots,x_n)),\end{aligned}$$

where $f_n(x_2,\dots,x_n) := \sum_{k=2}^n e^{\mathbf{i}wx_k}$.

We prepare the proof of Theorem 2.1 with some results of independent interest. We start with the classical connection between the typical cluster and the cluster of a typical point. In what follows we interpret $C(x)$ and $D(x)$ as point processes on $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. as measurable mappings from Ω to $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition 2.3. *For any measurable* $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [0,\infty)$

$$\gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta f(C(0) - \tau(0)) = \gamma_\xi\, \mathbb{E}^0_\xi |D(0)| f(D(0)) \tag{2.12}$$

Proof: We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\xi\, \mathbb{E}^0_\xi |D(0)| f(D(0)) &= \gamma_\xi\, \mathbb{E}^0_\xi \sum_{x\in\eta} f(D(0))\mathbf{1}\{\tau(x) = 0\} \\ &= \gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \sum_{x\in\xi} f(D(\theta_x,0))\mathbf{1}\{\tau(\theta_x,-x) = 0\} \\ &= \gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \sum_{x\in\xi} f(D(\theta_x,0))\mathbf{1}\{\tau(\theta_0,0) = x\},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 6.1 with $(\omega,x) \mapsto f(D(\omega,0))\mathbf{1}\{\tau(\omega,x) = 0\}$ to get the second and (2.1) to get the third identity. Using (2.1) again, it can be easily checked that $D(\theta_x\omega,0) = C(\omega,0) - x$, whenever $x \in \xi(\omega)$ and $\tau(\omega,0) = x$. This finishes the proof. □

Proposition (2.3) implies in particular that

$$\gamma_\xi\, \mathbb{E}^0_\xi |D(0)|^2 = \gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta |C(0)|, \tag{2.13}$$

which is finite by (2.4). Another consequence of Proposition (2.3) is

$$\gamma_\xi = \gamma_\eta \, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta |C(0)|^{-1}. \tag{2.14}$$

The number $\mathbb{E}^0_\eta |C(0)|^{-1}$ might be called the number of clusters per vertex in percolation theory; see e.g. [3].

We also need the following consequence of Proposition (2.3).

Lemma 2.4. *The relationship* (2.10) *is equivalent to*

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\xi \Big(\sum_{x \in D(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \neq 0 \Big) > 0, \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.15}$$

Proof: The relationship (2.15) holds iff

$$\mathbb{E}^0_\xi \Big| \sum_{x \in D(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \Big| \neq 0.$$

By (2.12) this is equivalent with

$$0 \neq \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \Big| \sum_{x \in C(0) - \tau(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \Big| = \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \Big| e^{-\mathbf{i}w\tau(0)} \sum_{x \in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \Big| = \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \Big| \sum_{x \in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \Big|.$$

This implies the assertion. □

The Fourier transform of P is the function $\hat{P} \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$\hat{P}(w) := \int P(x) e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \, dx, \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This transform can be expressed in terms of the typical cluster:

Proposition 2.5. *For any* $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \hat{P}(w) = \gamma_\xi \, \mathbb{E}^0_\xi \Big| \sum_{x \in D(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \Big|^2. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof: First we apply (6.10) with $(\omega, x) \mapsto \mathbf{1}\{x \in C(\omega, 0)\} e^{\mathbf{i}wy}$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \hat{P}(w) &= \gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \int \mathbb{P}^{0,x}(x \in C(0)) e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \rho(x) \, dx \\ &= \gamma_\eta \, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \sum_{x \in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wx}, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the integrability assumption (2.4).

Since the clusters exhaust the points of η we obtain that

$$\gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \hat{P}(w) = \gamma_\eta \, \mathbb{E}^0_\eta \sum_{x \in \xi} \sum_{y \in C(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wy} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(y) = x\}.$$

Using the exchange formula (6.6) (to be justified below) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \hat{P}(w) =& \gamma_\xi \, \mathbb{E}_\xi^0 \sum_{x\in\eta} \sum_{y\in C(\theta_x,0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wy} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\theta_x, y) = -x\} \\ =& \gamma_\xi \, \mathbb{E}_\xi^0 \sum_{x\in\eta} \sum_{y\in\eta} \mathbf{1}\{y - x \in C(\theta_x, 0)\} e^{\mathbf{i}w(y-x)} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(\theta_x, y-x) = -x\} \\ =& \gamma_\xi \, \mathbb{E}_\xi^0 \sum_{x\in\eta} \sum_{y\in C(x)} e^{-\mathbf{i}wx} e^{\mathbf{i}wy} \mathbf{1}\{\tau(y) = 0\},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the invariance properties (2.1) and (2.3). For $0 \in \xi$ and $x, y \in \eta$ the relations $y \in C(x)$ and $\tau(y) = 0$ are equivalent with $x, y \in D(0)$. Hence

$$\gamma_\eta + \gamma_\eta^2 \hat{P}(w) = \gamma_\xi \, \mathbb{E}_\xi^0 \sum_{x\in D(0)} e^{-\mathbf{i}wx} \sum_{y\in D(0)} e^{\mathbf{i}wy},$$

implying (by Fubini's theorem) the asserted formula (2.16). The use of both the exchange formula and Fubini's theorem is justified by $\mathbb{E}_\xi^0 |D(0)|^2 < \infty$, a consequence of (2.13) and assumption (2.4). □

Proof of Theorem 2.1: We shall use a classical theorem by Wiener on the inversion of Fourier transforms. Recall that a *finite signed measure* μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is the difference of two finite measures. The Fourier transform of such a μ is defined by

$$\hat{\mu}(w) := \int e^{\mathbf{i}wx} \, \mu(dx), \quad w \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The convolution $\mu * \nu$ of two finite signed measures μ and ν is the finite signed measure defined by

$$\mu * \nu(B) := \iint \mathbf{1}\{x + y \in B\} \, \mu(dx) \, \nu(dy), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}^d.$$

Note $\mu * \delta_0 = \mu$, where $\delta_0(B) := \mathbf{1}\{0 \in B\}$, $B \in \mathcal{B}^d$. Also note that $\widehat{\mu * \nu} = \hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}$. Each $f \in L^1$ defines a finite signed measure $\mu_f := \int \mathbf{1}\{x \in \cdot\} f(x) \, dx$. (Later we will abuse notation and write f instead of μ_f.) For $f, g \in L^1$ we have $\mu_f * \mu_g = \mu_{f*g}$.

Let M^1 denote the vector space of all finite signed measures of the form $r\delta_0 + \mu_f$, where $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in L^1$. The Ornstein-Zernike equation (2.11) can be written as

$$\mu_P = t\mu_Q * \nu, \tag{2.17}$$

where $t := \gamma_\eta$ and $\nu := t^{-1}\delta_0 + \mu_P \in M^1$. Proposition 2.5, assumption (2.10) and Lemma 2.4 imply that $\hat{\nu}(w) \neq 0$ for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A theorem of Wiener (see Satz 13.2 in [5]) says that ν can be inverted within the convolution algebra M^1. This means that there is an $f \in L^1$ such that

$$\nu * (t\delta_0 + t^2\mu_f) = \delta_0.$$

The function $Q := P + tP * f$ is in L^1. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}t\mu_Q * \nu &= t\nu * (\mu_P + t\mu_{P*f}) = \nu * (t\mu_P + t^2\mu_P * \mu_f) \\ &= \nu * \mu_P * (t\delta_0 + t^2\mu_f) = \mu_P * \delta_0 = \mu_P,\end{aligned}$$

as required by (2.17).

To show that Q is bounded, we apply (2.8) to obtain

$$\|Q\|_\infty = \|P\|_\infty + \gamma_\eta \|Q * P\|_\infty \le \|P\|_\infty + \gamma_\eta \|Q\|_1 \|P\|_\infty < \infty. \tag{2.18}$$

□

The solution Q of the OZ-equation (2.11) has good integrability properties and can be used to express the mean size of the cluster containing a typical point:

Proposition 2.6. *Under the assumption of Theorem 2.1 we have that*

$$0 \le \int Q(x)dx < \gamma_\eta^{-1} \tag{2.19}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| = \left(1 - \gamma_\eta \int Q(x)dx\right)^{-1}. \tag{2.20}$$

Proof: Equation (2.7) and the OZ-equation (2.11) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| &= 1 + \gamma_\eta \int Q(x)dx + \gamma_\eta^2 \int P(x)dx \int Q(x)dx \\ &= 1 + \gamma_\eta \int Q(x)dx + \gamma_\eta \big(\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| - 1\big) \int Q(x)dx.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| = 1 + \gamma_\eta \mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| \int Q(x)dx. \tag{2.21}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| \ge 1$ we conclude that $\int Q(x)dx \ge 0$. Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 |C(0)| < \infty$ we have $\gamma_\eta \int Q(x)dx < 1$ and hence (2.20). □

3 The random connection model

In this section we consider a stationary Poisson process η_t on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity $t \ge 0$ together with a measurable function $\varphi \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ satisfying

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi(-x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\int \varphi(x)\, dx < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Suppose any two distinct points $x, y \in \eta_t$ are adjacent with probability $\varphi(y - x)$ independently of all other pairs and independently of η_t. This yields the random connection model (RCM), an undirected *random graph* $\mathcal{G}$ with vertex set η_t. Each $x \in \eta_t$ belongs to

a uniquely defined connected component $C'(x)$. The mapping τ from Section 2 is defined as follows. If $x \in \eta_t$ and $|C'(x)| < \infty$ then we let $\tau(x)$ be the lexicographic minimum of $C'(x)$. (For all other $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we let $\tau(x) := x$.) Hence, if all connected components of $\mathcal{G}$ are finite, the set of clusters consists exactly of these connected components.

The Gilbert graph (briefly discussed in the introduction) based on η_t and a *gauge body* $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, that is a compact and connected set containing the origin $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is a special case of the RCM. It is obtained by choosing

$$\varphi(x) = \mathbf{1}\{(B + x) \cap B \neq \emptyset\}.$$

In contrast to the RCM, the Gilbert graph contains no additional randomness. Two points $x, y \in \eta_t$ are adjacent if the shifted gauge bodies $B + x$ and $B + y$ overlap.

In the next sections we shall study the properties of the pair-connectedness function P_t of the RCM and the solution Q_t of the associated OZE. In particular we shall show that P_t and Q_t are analytic and relate the coefficients of their series representation at 0. To do this properly we need to introduce the model in a more formal way. If the intensity t is positive, then η_t can be (almost surely) represented as

$$\eta_t = \{X_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where the X_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are a.s. distinct random elements in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $t = 0$ the Poisson process η_t has (almost surely) no point. Let $\mathbb{R}^{[2d]}$ denote the space of all sets $e \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ containing exactly two elements. Any $e \in \mathbb{R}^{[2d]}$ is a potential edge of the RCM. When equipped with the Hausdorff metric (see [15]) this space is a Borel subset of a complete separable metric space. Let $<$ denote the strict lexicographic ordering on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Introduce independent random variables $U_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, uniformly distributed on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ such that the double sequence $(U_{i,j})$ is independent of η_t. For $t > 0$

$$\chi_t := \{(\{X_i, X_j\}, U_{i,j}) : X_i < X_j, i, j \in \mathbb{N}\}, \quad t > 0, \tag{3.3}$$

is a point process on $\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0, 1]$. For $t = 0$ we let χ_t equal the zero measure. Note that η_t can be recovered from χ_t. For $t > 0$ we can define the RCM as a deterministic functional of χ_t by taking for $i \neq j$ and $X_i < X_j$ the set $\{X_i, X_j\}$ as an edge of $\mathcal{G}$ iff $U_{i,j} \leq \varphi(X_i - X_j)$.

Justified by assumption (3.1) we can introduce a measurable function $\varphi^* \colon \mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \to [0, 1]$ by

$$\varphi^*(e) := \varphi(y - x), \quad e = \{x, y\} \in \mathbb{R}^{[2d]}.$$

If $\tilde{\chi}$ is a point process on $\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0, 1]$, we can define a graph $\mathcal{G}(\tilde{\chi}) := \mathcal{G}(\tilde{\chi}) = (V(\tilde{\chi}), E(\tilde{\chi}))$ as follows. The vertex set is given by

$$V(\tilde{\chi}) := \{e^-, e^+ : e \in \mathbb{R}^{[2d]}, \tilde{\chi}(\{e\} \times [0, 1]) = 1\}, \tag{3.4}$$

where e^- and e^+ are the endpoints of $e \in \mathbb{R}^{[2d]}$. A set $e \in \mathbb{R}^{[2d]}$ belongs to the edge set $E(\tilde{\chi})$ of this graph iff $\tilde{\chi}(\{(e, u)\}) = 1$ for some $u \in [0, 1]$ with $u \leq \varphi^*(e)$. In this notation our RCM is given as $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t)$. (For $t = 0$ this is the empty graph.) For $x \in V(\tilde{\chi})$ we denote the cluster of x (the connected component of $\mathcal{G}(\tilde{\chi})$) by $C(x, \tilde{\chi})$. (For convenience we set $C(x, \tilde{\chi}) := \{x\}$ for all other $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.)

In the remaining part of this section we give a few fundamental results on the RCM that will be needed later but cannot be found in the literature. We extend the (double) sequence $(U_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{\infty}$ featuring in (3.3) to a sequence $(U_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^{\infty}$ of independent random variables uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$, independent of the Poisson process η_t. For $t>0$ we then define a point process χ_t^0 on $\mathbb{R}^{[2d]}\times[0,1]$ by

$$\chi_t^0 := \{(\{X_i, X_j\}, U_{i,j}) : X_i < X_j, i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ and $X_0 := 0$. The graph $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t^0)$ can be interpreted as the the RCM as seen from a *typical vertex* positioned at the origin. For $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we define

$$\chi_t^{0,x} := \{(\{X_i, X_j\}, U_{i,j}) : X_i < X_j, i,j \in \mathbb{N}_{-1}\}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_{-1} := \mathbb{N}_0\cup\{-1\}$, $X_{-1} := x$ and $(U_{i,j})_{i,j=-1}^{\infty}$ has similar properties as $(U_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^{\infty}$. In the case $t=0$ the point processes χ_t^0 and $\chi_t^{0,x}$ are defined to be the empty set.

For $k\in\mathbb{N}$ we let $[k] := \{1,2,\dots,k\}$. For any $x_1,\dots,x_k\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we introduce a random graph $\Gamma(x_1,\dots,x_k)$ with vertex set $\{x_1,\dots,x_k\}$ by taking independent random variables $U_{i,j}$, $i,j\in[k]$, with the uniform distribution on $[0,1]$ and by taking $\{x_i,x_j\}$ as an edge if $x_i<x_j$ and $U_{i,j}\le\varphi(x_i-x_j)$. This is just the RCM with a finite deterministic vertex set. The next result is a version of Proposition 6.2 in [9]. For the convenience of the reader we give a short proof.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$ and set $x_0 := 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^0\big)\big| = n+1\big) = \frac{t^n}{n!}\int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0,\dots,x_n) \textit{ is connected})\\ \times\exp\bigg[-t\int\bigg(1-\prod_{i=0}^{n}(1-\varphi(y-x_i))\bigg)\,dy\bigg]\,d(x_1,\dots,x_n).\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

In the case $n=0$ the right hand side has to be read as $\exp\big(-t\int\varphi(y)\,dy\big)$.

Proof: We assume that $n\ge1$. (The case $n=0$ is trivial.) We have that $|C(0,\chi_t^0)| = n+1$ iff there are n distinct points $x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta_t$ such that $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t^0)$ restricted to those points is connected and none of the x_i is connected to a point in $\eta_t\setminus\{x_1,\dots,x_n\}$. Given η_t, these two events are (conditionally) independent and have respective probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0,\dots,x_n)$ is connected) and

$$\prod_{y\in\eta_t\setminus\{x_1,\dots,x_n\}}\prod_{i=0}^{n}(1-\varphi(y-x_i)).$$

After conditioning we obtain from the multivariate Mecke equation (6.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\big(\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^0\big)\big| = n+1\big)\\ &= \frac{t^n}{n!}\int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0,\dots,x_n)\text{ is connected})\mathbb{E}\prod_{y\in\eta_t}\prod_{i=0}^{n}(1-\varphi(y-x_i))\,d(x_1,\dots,x_n).\end{aligned}$$

Using the well-known formula for the characteristic functional of η_t (see e.g. [8, Chapter 3]) we get the asserted formula (3.7). □

Next we need to discuss a Margulis-Russo type formula for $\chi_t^{0,x}$. This formula provdides a power series expansion of expectations of functions of $\chi_t^{0,x}$. Adding just two points $0, x$ is enough for our purposes. It would be no problem to extend the result to a random connection model with any fixed number of points added. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{N}_{-n-1} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, -1, \ldots, -n-1\}$. Extend the (double) sequence $(U_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{\infty}$ featuring in (2.2) to a sequence $(U_{i,j})_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}_{-n-1}}$ of independent random variables uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$, independent of the Poisson process η_t. Let $x_0, x_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ For $J \subset [n]$ we define $\mathbf{x}_J := (x_i)_{i\in J}$ and

$$\chi_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_J,x_{n+1}} := \{(\{X_i, X_j\}, U_{i,j}) : X_i < X_j, i, j \in \mathbb{N}_J\}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_J := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, -n-1\} \cup \{-i : i \in J\}$ and $(X_0, \ldots, X_{-n-1}) := (x_0, \ldots, x_{n+1})$. In the case $t = 0$ the indices i, j are restricted to $\{-i : i \in J\}$. Similarly we define the point process $\chi_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_J}$. For $J = \emptyset$ we set $\chi_t^{x_0} := \chi_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_\emptyset}$. For $x_{n+1} := x$ and $J = \emptyset$ the point process $\chi_t^{0,\mathbf{x}_\emptyset,x}$ has the same distribution as $\chi_t^{0,x}$ given by (3.6). Let $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1]) \to \mathbb{R}$ be measurable and fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $F_t := f\big(\chi_t^{0,x}\big)$ and

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}^n F_t := \sum_{J\subset[n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} f\big(\chi_t^{0,\mathbf{x}_J,x}\big), \quad \mathbf{x} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n. \tag{3.9}$$

We say that $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1]) \to \mathbb{R}$ is *determined* by a compact subset $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, if $f(\mu) = f(\mu_W)$ for all $\mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1])$, where

$$\mu_W := \{(e, u) \in \mu : e \subset W\}, \tag{3.10}$$

i.e. if the value of f only depends on the edges with endpoints in W.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1]) \to \mathbb{R}$ be measurable and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that f is determined by a compact set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\{0, x\} \subset W$. Let $s \geq 0$ and $t \geq -s$ such that $\mathbb{E}|F_{s+|t|}| < \infty$, where $F_t := f\big(\chi_t^{0,x}\big)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}F_{s+t} = \mathbb{E}F_s + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{n!} \int_{W^n} \mathbb{E}\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}^n F_s \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof: First we recall the Poisson process analogue of the Margulis-Russo formula to be found in [10] and for a general phase space and more general integrability assumptions in [7, 8]. Let $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ be measurable, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$. Then we define a measurable function $D_{\mathbf{x}}^n f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$D_{\mathbf{x}}^n f(\mu) := \sum_{J\subset[n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} f\big(\mu \cup \{x_j : j \in J\}\big). \tag{3.12}$$

Assume now that there is a compact set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(\mu)$ depends for each $\mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ only on the restriction of μ to W. Then we have for all $s \geq 0$ and $t \geq -s$ that

$$\mathbb{E}f(\eta_{s+t}) = \mathbb{E}f(\eta_s) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{n!} \int_{W^n} \big(\mathbb{E}D_{\mathbf{x}}^n f(\eta_s)\big) \, d\mathbf{x}, \tag{3.13}$$

provided that $\mathbb{E}|f(\eta_{s+|t|})| < \infty$.

For $\mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mu^{x_1,\dots,x_k} := \mu \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. There is a probability kernel K from $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1])$ such that for all $r \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}((\eta_r, \chi_r) \in \cdot) = \mathbb{E} \int \mathbf{1}\{(\eta_r, \psi) \in \cdot\}\, K(\eta_r, d\psi), \tag{3.14}$$

and, for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $n \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\big(\eta_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}}, \chi_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}}\big) \in \cdot\big) = \mathbb{E} \int \mathbf{1}\big\{\big(\eta_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}}, \psi\big) \in \cdot\big\}\, K\big(\eta_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x}}, d\psi\big). \tag{3.15}$$

Define a measurable function $f^*\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f^*(\mu) := \int f(\psi)\, K(\mu^{0,x}, d\psi).$$

By the triangle inequality and (3.15) for $n = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}|f^*(\eta_{s+|t|})| \leq \mathbb{E} \int |f(\psi)|\, K(\eta_{s+|t|}^{0,x}, d\psi) = \mathbb{E}|F_{s+|t|}| < \infty.$$

The properties of the kernel K imply that

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(\mu_W) &= \int f(\psi_W)\, K(\mu_W^{0,x}, d\psi) = \int f(\psi_W)\, K(\mu^{0,x}, d\psi) \\ &= \int f(\psi)\, K(\mu^{0,x}, d\psi) = f^*(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

We can now apply (3.13) with f^* to obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}f^*(\eta_{s+t}) = \mathbb{E}f^*(\eta_s) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n}{n!} \int_{W^n} \mathbb{E}D_{\mathbf{x}}^n f^*(\eta_s)\, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{3.16}$$

By (3.15) we have $\mathbb{E}f^*(\eta_{s+t}) = \mathbb{E}F_{s+t}$ and $\mathbb{E}f^*(\eta_s) = \mathbb{E}F_s$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}D_{\mathbf{x}}^n f^*(\eta_s) &= \sum_{J \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} \mathbb{E}f^*(\eta_s \cup \{x_j : j \in J\}) \\ &= \sum_{J \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} \mathbb{E} \int f(\psi)\, K\big(\eta_s^{0,x} \cup \{x_j : j \in J\}, d\psi\big) \\ &= \sum_{J \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} \mathbb{E} f\big(\chi_s^{0,\mathbf{x}_J,x}\big). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the definition (3.9), we obtain the assertion. □

We also need the following version of Proposition 3.1. The proof is omitted.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\big(x \in C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big), \big|C(0, \chi_t^{0,x})\big| = n+2\big) = \frac{t^n}{n!} \int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}) \text{ is connected}) \\ \times \exp\bigg[-t \int \bigg(1 - \prod_{i=0}^{n+1} (1 - \varphi(y - x_i))\bigg)\, dy \bigg]\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n), \end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 := 0$ and $x_{n+1} := x$.

4 The OZE for the random connection model

In this section we consider Poisson processes η_t with intensity $t \geq 0$ and the associated RCM $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t)$ as introduced in the previous section. We assume that

$$0 < m_\varphi < \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

where $m_\varphi := \int \varphi(x)\,dx$.

The *critical intensity* is given by

$$t_c := \sup\big\{t \geq 0 : \mathbb{P}\big(\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| < \infty\big) = 0\big\}.$$

For the Gilbert graph (in fact for general Boolean models) it was proved in [4] that $0 < t_c < \infty$. The same is true for the more general RCM; see [9, Theorem 6.1]. By [9, Theorem 6.2] we have that

$$t_c = \sup\big\{t \geq 0 : \mathbb{E}\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| < \infty\big\}. \tag{4.2}$$

We need to consider another critical intensity, namely

$$t_* := \sup\big\{t \geq 0 : \mathbb{E}\exp\big(z\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big|\big) < \infty \text{ for some } z > 0\big\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Clearly we have $t_* \leq t_c$. For the Gilbert graph it is basically well-known that $t_* = t_c$. (The arguments from [14] can be extended from a convex and symmetric gauge body to a general B.) We are not aware of a similar result for the RCM. However, one can show, that

$$t_* \geq m_\varphi^{-1}. \tag{4.4}$$

This is due to the fact, that for $t < m_\varphi^{-1}$ the number of points in the cluster of the origin can be dominated by the total progeny of a subcritical Galton-Watson process with Poisson offspring distribution with mean $tm_\varphi < 1$; see the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [9]. It is well known, that this progeny is Borel distributed and hence has exponential moments [11].

By (6.12) the pair correlation function ρ_t of η_t satisfies $\rho_t \equiv 1$, so that the two-point Palm probability measures $\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^{x,y}$ of η_t are well-defined. They are given given by the following lemma. Recall the definition (3.5) of χ_t^0 and the definition (3.8) of $\chi_t^{x,y}$.

Lemma 4.1. *We have $\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^0\big(\chi_t \in \cdot\big) = \mathbb{P}\big(\chi_t^0 \in \cdot\big)$. Moreover, the Palm probability $\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^{x,y}$ can be chosen such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^{x,y}\big(\chi_t \in \cdot\big) = \mathbb{P}\big(\chi_t^{x,y} \in \cdot\big), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof: We prove the second formula. Let $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^{[2d]} \times [0,1]) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$ be measurable. Then we obtain from (3.14) and the Mecke equation (6.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\sum_{x,y\in\eta_t}^{\neq} f(\chi_t, x, y) &= \mathbb{E}\sum_{x,y\in\eta_t}^{\neq} \int f(\psi, x, y)\, K(\eta_t, d\psi) \\
&= t^2\, \mathbb{E}\iint f(\psi, x, y)\, K\big(\eta_t^{x,y}, d\psi\big)\, d(x,y) \\
&= t^2\, \mathbb{E}\int f\big(\chi_t^{x,y}, x, y\big)\, d(x,y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sum^{\neq}$ denotes summation over all pairs of distinct elements of η (a notation that is also used for multi-indices) and where we have used (3.15) to get the final identity. Comparing this with (6.9) (and using that the pair correlation function ρ_t of η_t satisfies $\rho_t \equiv 1$), shows that (4.5) holds for almost every (x, y) (with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. This shows the assertion. □

By Lemma 4.1 the pair connectedness function P_t of the RCM $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t)$ is given by $P_t(x, y) = P_t(y - x)$, where

$$P_t(x) := \mathbb{P}\big(x \in C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big). \tag{4.6}$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $t < t_c$. Then there is a unique $Q_t \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$ such that*

$$P_t = Q_t + tQ_t * P_t. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof: We wish to apply Theorem 2.1. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define $\tau(x) := x$ if x is not a member of a finite cluster in $\mathcal{G}(\chi_t)$. Otherwise we define $\tau(x)$ as the lexicographic minimum of the cluster $C(x, \chi_t)$. Then we have almost surely that $C(x) = C(x, \chi_t)$ for all $x \in \eta_t$, where $C(x)$ is given by (2.2). Since $t < t_c$ the integrability assumption (2.4) follows from (4.2). Since the factorial moments measures of η_t coincide with Lebesgue measure (see (6.12)), Assumption (2.10) follows from Remark 2.2. □

Proposition 4.3. *We have*

$$0 \leq \int Q_t(x)dx < t^{-1}, \quad 0 < t < t_c, \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| = \left(1 - t \int Q_t(x)dx\right)^{-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof: The two assertions follow from Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 4.1. □

Remark 4.4. It is a fair conjecture that $\lim_{t\uparrow t_c} \mathbb{E}\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| = \infty$, but we have not found this in the literature. Under this hypothesis (4.9) would show that

$$t_c \lim_{t\to t_c-} \int Q_t(x)dx = 1. \tag{4.10}$$

In what follows we consider a measurable function $g\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ and fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We study the function $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big)$. The results will imply, that $t \mapsto P_t(x)$ and $t \mapsto Q_t(x)$ are analytic functions on $[0, t_*)$. We assume that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$|g(\mu)| \leq e^{\varepsilon\mu(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq n_0. \tag{4.11}$$

This implies, that there is an $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|g(\mu)| \leq \exp\big(\varepsilon \max\big\{\mu(\mathbb{R}^d), n_1\big\}\big). \tag{4.12}$$

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that $g\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (4.11) and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the function $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big)$ is analytic on $[0, t_*)$. The expansion at $s \in [0, t_*)$ is given by (3.11) with $F_t := g\big(C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big)$.*

For the proof of Theorem 4.5 we derive some preliminary results, that might be of independent interest. Let $s, t \in [0, t^*)$ and define

$$G(x,t) := \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big). \tag{4.13}$$

We take a compact set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\{0, x\} \subset W$ and approximate the function G with

$$G_W(x,t) := \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0, \chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big)\big), \tag{4.14}$$

where $\chi_{t,W}^{0,x} := \big(\chi_t^{0,x}\big)_W$; see (3.10). Note that $\mu \mapsto g(C(0, \mu_W))$ is determined by W. Let $z > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}\exp\big(2z\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big|\big) < \infty$. Since

$$\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big| \le \big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| + \big|C\big(x, \chi_t^x\big)\big| \tag{4.15}$$

and $C\big(x, \chi_t^x\big) \stackrel{d}{=} C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)$ we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\big(z\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big|\big) < \infty.$$

Choosing $\varepsilon = z$ in assumption (4.12) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\big|g\big(C\big(0, \chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big)\big)\big| &\le \mathbb{E}\exp\big(z\max\big\{\big|C\big(0, \chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big)\big|, n_1\big\}\big)\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\exp\big(z\max\big\{\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big|, n_1\big\}\big) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can apply Theorem 3.2 to obtain that

$$G_W(x,t) = \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0, \chi_{s,W}^{0,x}\big)\big) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(t-s)^n g_{W,n}(x,s), \quad t < t_*, \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$g_{W,n}(x,s) := \frac{1}{n!}\int_{W^n}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\sum_{J\subset[n]}(-1)^{n-|J|}g\Big(C\Big(0, \chi_{s,W}^{0,\mathbf{x}_J,x}\Big)\Big)\bigg]\,d\mathbf{x}, \tag{4.17}$$

and $\chi_{s,W}^{0,\mathbf{x}_J,x} := \big(\chi_s^{0,\mathbf{x}_J,x}\big)_W$. We use this definition for all Borel sets $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

To bound the coefficients $g_{W,n}(x,t)$, we use the following integral inequality. Recall that $\Gamma(0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denotes a RCM with vertex set $\{0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ is connected})\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n) \le n! m_\varphi^n e^{n+1}. \tag{4.18}$$

Furthermore we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$\int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(0, x_1, \dots, x_n, x) \text{ is connected})\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n) \le n! m_\varphi^n e^{n+2}. \tag{4.19}$$

Proof: We prove the second inequality. For all $a_0, \dots, a_{n+1} \in [0,1]$ we have the inequality

$$1 - \prod_{i=0}^{n+1}(1-a_i) \le \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} a_i.$$

For any $t > 0$ we therefore obtain from Proposition 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\ge \frac{t^n}{n!} \int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n, x) \text{ is connected}) \exp\Big(- t \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \int \varphi(y - x_i)\, dy \Big)\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ &\ge \frac{t^n}{n!} \int \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n, x) \text{ is connected}) \exp(-t(n+2)m_\varphi)\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $t = m_\varphi^{-1}$ yields the asserted inequality. □

There is a qualitative difference between the study of analyticity of G at $s = 0$ and $s > 0$. In fact the condition (4.11) can be slightly relaxed for $s = 0$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that there is a constant $c \ge 1$, such that*

$$|g(\mu)| \le c^{\mu(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad \mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) \le n+1. \tag{4.20}$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Borel set such that $\{0, x\} \subset W$. Then

$$|g_{W,n}(0,x)| \le c(c+1)(1+e)\big((1+c)m_\varphi e\big)^n. \tag{4.21}$$

Proof: Let $x_0 := 0$ and $x_{n+1} := x$. Take $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in W^n$. We recall, that for $s = 0$, the point process η_s is the zero measure and $\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}) = \mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{x_0, \mathbf{x}, x_{n+1}}\big)$ is the RCM with vertex set $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$. Let $i \in [n]$ such that x_0 and x_i are not connected by a path in $\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$. Then we have for any $J \subset [n] \setminus \{i\}$ that

$$(-1)^{n-|J|} g\big(C\big(0, \chi_0^{x_0, \mathbf{x}_J, x_{n+1}}\big)\big) + (-1)^{n-|J\cup\{i\}|} g\big(C\big(0, \chi_0^{x_0, \mathbf{x}_{J\cup\{i\}}, x_{n+1}}\big)\big) = 0,$$

since the cluster of 0 is the same in both summands. If, on the other hand, x_0 and x_i are connected in $\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$ for each $i \in [n]$ then either $\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is connected (and x is not connected to any of the points $x_0, \dots, x_n$) or $\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$ is connected. Hence we have that

$$|g_{W,n}(0,x)| \le \frac{1}{n!} \mathbb{E} \int h(x_1, \dots, x_n, x) \sum_{J \subset [n]} \big| g\big(C\big(0, \chi_0^{x_0, \mathbf{x}_J, x_n}\big)\big)\big|\, d\mathbf{x}.$$

where

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n, x) := \mathbf{1}\{\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_n) \text{ is connected}\} + \mathbf{1}\{\Gamma(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}) \text{ is connected}\}.$$

Our assumption (4.20) and the binomial formula imply that

$$|g_{W,n}(0,x)| \le \frac{c(c+1)^n}{n!} \int h(x_1, \dots, x_n, x)\, d(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Using here Lemma 4.6 concludes the proof. □

In the following it is convenient to introduce a function $c_V\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ with $c_V(t) > 0$ for $t < t_*$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big| = n\big) \le e^{-c_V(t)n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d,\; t < t_*. \tag{4.22}$$

By definition of t_* and (4.15), such a function exists. We next bound $g_n(t,W)$ for $t > 0$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $t \in (0,t_*)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that (4.11) holds. Then there is an $n_0(t) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_0(t)$ and all Borel sets $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\{0,x\} \subset W$*

$$|g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le \frac{e^{-c_V(t)/2}}{1-e^{-c_V(t)/2}} \left(\frac{2e^{-c_V(t)/2}}{t(1-e^{-c_V(t)/2})}\right)^n. \tag{4.23}$$

Proof: As before we set $x_0 := 0$ and $x_{n+1} := x$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. With the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.7 we conclude, that

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le \frac{1}{n!} \int_{W^n} \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbf{1}\big\{x_i \in C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}\big) \text{ for all } \in [n]\big\} \\ \times \sum_{J\subset[n]} \big|g\big(C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_J,x_{n+1}}\big)\big)\big|\Big]\, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Setting $\varepsilon := c_V(t)/2$ and using (4.11) we find an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{J\subset[n]} \big|g\big(C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_J,x_{n+1}}\big)\big)\big| &\le \sum_{J\subset[n]} \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\big\{n_0, \big|C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{x_0,\mathbf{x}_J,x_{n+1}}\big)\big|\big\}\Big) \\ &\le 2^n \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\big\{n_0, \big|C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}\big)\big|\big\}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this in (4.24) and using (3.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le& \frac{2^n}{n!}\mathbb{E} \iint \mathbf{1}\big\{x_i \in C\big(0,\psi_W\big) \text{ for all } i \in [n]\big\} \\ &\times \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\{n_0, |C(0,\psi_W)|\}\Big)\, K\big(\eta_t^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}, d\psi\big)\, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The Mecke equation (6.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{W,n}(x,t)| &\le \frac{2^n}{t^n n!}\mathbb{E} \sum_{x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta_t}^{\neq} \int \mathbf{1}\big\{x_i \in C\big(0,\psi_W\big) \text{ for all } i \in [n]\big\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\big\{n_0, \big|C\big(0,\psi_W\big)\big|\big\}\Big)\, K(\eta_t^{0,x}, d\psi) \\ &= \frac{2^n}{t^n n!}\mathbb{E} \sum_{x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta_t}^{\neq} \mathbf{1}\big\{x_i \in C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big) \text{ for all } i \in [n]\big\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\big\{n_0, \big|C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big)\big|\big\}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.15) to achieve the final identity. Therefore

$$|g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le \frac{2^n}{t^n n!} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\mathbf{1}\big\{\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big| = k\big\} \exp\Big(\frac{c_V(t)}{2} \max\big\{n_0, \big|C\big(0,\chi_{t,W}^{0,x}\big)\big|\big\}\Big) \\ \times \sum_{x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta_t}^{\neq} \mathbf{1}\big\{x_i \in C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big) \text{ for all } i \in [n]\big\}.$$

On the event $\big\{\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big| = k\big\}$ the above integral simplifies to $(k-1)\cdots(k-n)$. Hence

$$|g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le \frac{2^n}{n!t^n} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{c_V(t)}{2}\max\{n_0,k\}}(k-1)\cdots(k-n)\mathbb{P}\big(\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big| = k\big).$$

Finally we apply (4.22) and use the well known formula for the factorial moment of the geometric distribution, to get for $n > n_0$ that

$$|g_{W,n}(x,t)| \le \frac{2^n}{n!t^n} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{c_V(t)}{2}k}(k-1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(k-n) = \frac{e^{-c_V(t)/2}}{1-e^{-c_V(t)/2}} \left(\frac{2e^{-c_V(t)/2}}{t(1-e^{-c_V(t)/2})}\right)^n,$$

as asserted. □

Proof of Theorem 4.5: Let W_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of compact sets with union $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since $\mathbb{P}\big(\big|C(0,\chi_t^{0,x})\big| < \infty\big) = 1$ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} g\big(C\big(0,\chi_{t,W_k}^{0,x}\big)\big) = g\big(C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By (4.12),

$$\begin{aligned}\big|g\big(C\big(0,\chi_{t,W_k}^{0,x}\big)\big)\big| &\le \exp\big(c_V(t)\max\big\{\big|C\big(0,\chi_{t,W_k}^{0,x}\big)\big|, n_1\big\}\big) \\ &\le \exp\big(c_V(t)\max\big\{\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x},\big)\big|, n_1\big\}\big).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.22), that

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\big(c_V(t)\big|C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big|\big) < \infty.$$

Dominated convergence implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} G_{W_k}(x,t) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0,\chi_{t,W_k}^{0,x}\big)\big) = \mathbb{E}g\big(C\big(0,\chi_t^{0,x}\big)\big) = G(x,t).$$

Similarly, dominated convergence implies for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} g_{W_k,n}(x,s) = g_{\mathbb{R}^d,n}(x,s).$$

Now we use the series representation (4.16) for $W = W_k$. The Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8 allow us to apply dominated convergence to obtain that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} G_{W_k}(t) = G(s) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(t-s)^n \lim_{k\to\infty} g_{W_k,n}(x,s) = G(s) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(t-s)^n g_{\mathbb{R}^d,n}(x,s)$$

holds for all t in some open neighborhood of $s \in [0, t_c)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We want to point out, that due to the relaxed growth bound of Lemma 4.7 in comparison to (4.11), any functional that grows exponentially in the size of the cluster of the origin is analytic at least in $s = 0$. The Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8 also give a lower bound for the radius of convergence of the series representation of $G(t)$ which is rather small though.

Theorem 4.5 shows that the pair connectedness function and the expected cluster size are analytic functions on the whole interval $[0, t_*)$. In particular, given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, every $s \in [0, t_*)$ has a neighbourhood $U(s)$ such that

$$P_t(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t-s)^n p_n(x, s), \quad t \in U(s),$$

where $p_0(x, s) := P_s(x)$ and, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$p_n(x, s) := \frac{1}{n!} \int \mathbb{E} \sum_{J \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} \mathbf{1}\big\{x \in C\big(0, \chi_s^{0, \mathbf{x}_J, x}\big)\big\} \, d\mathbf{x}. \tag{4.25}$$

We summarize the integrability properties of the coefficients p_n in the following corollary.

Corollary 4.9. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $t \in [0, t_*)$ there are constants $c_1(t), c_2(t)$ such that*

$$\|p_n(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \le c_1(t) c_2(t)^n, \tag{4.26}$$
$$\|p_n(\cdot, t)\|_1 \le c_1(t) c_2(t)^n. \tag{4.27}$$

Moreover, for any $s \in [0, t_*)$ there is a neighbourhood $U(s)$ such that

$$P_t(\cdot) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t-s)^n p_n(\cdot, t), \quad t \in U(s), \tag{4.28}$$

where the convergence holds in L^1 and L^∞.

Proof: We observed in the proofs of Lemma 4.7 and 4.8, that the bounds on g_n only depend on the growth bounds (4.11) or (4.12) respectively, which immediately yields the bound of $\|p_n(\cdot, t)\|_\infty$.

The arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.7 show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |p_n(x, 0)| \, dx \le \frac{2^n}{n!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{n+1}} \mathbf{1}\{\Gamma(0, x_1, \dots, x_n, x\} \text{ is connected}\} \, d(x_1, \dots, x_n, x)$$

which can be bounded using Lemma 4.6. The bound on $\|p_n(\cdot, t)\|_1$ with $t > 0$ can be derived in a similar way. It is clear, that these bounds imply the L^1 and L^∞ convergence of the sum in (4.28) for t in a neighbourhood $U(s)$ of s. $\square$

With a good understanding of the analyticity of P_t we are now able to show similar results for the solution Q_t of the Ornstein-Zernike equation. We will write f^{*n} for an n-fold convolution of the function f with itself, i.e. $f^{*(n+1)} := f^{*n} * f$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f^{*1} := f$. In the same spirit, we define $*_{k=a}^{b} f_k := f_b * (*_{k=a}^{b-1} f_k)$ and $*_{k=a}^{a} f_k := f_a$ for $a < b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and functions $f_a, \dots, f_b$.

Proposition 4.10. *If $t \geq 0$ is, such that $\mathbb{E}\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| < 2$, then*

$$Q_t = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-t)^n P_t^{*(n+1)} \tag{4.29}$$

in L^1 and L^∞. Moreover, for any $s \in [0, t_*)$ there is a neighbourhood $U(s)$ and functions $q_n(\cdot, t_*)$, such that

$$Q_t(\cdot) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (t-s)^n q_n(\cdot, s), \quad t \in U(s) \tag{4.30}$$

in L^1 and L^∞. The coefficients can be recursively determined by the solvable equations

$$q_0(\cdot, s) + s p_0(\cdot, s) * q_0(\cdot, s) = p_0(\cdot, s), \tag{4.31}$$

$$q_n(\cdot, s) + s q_n(\cdot, s) * p_0(\cdot, s) = p_n(\cdot, s) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{n-k}(\cdot, s) * (p_{k-1}(\cdot, s) + s p_k(\cdot, s)). \tag{4.32}$$

Proof: From $\mathbb{E}\big|C\big(0, \chi_t^0\big)\big| < 2$ and (2.7) we obtain $t\|P_t\|_1 < 1$. By (2.9) and (2.8) we have

$$\big\|P_t^{*k+1}\big\|_\infty \leq \|P_t\|_1^k \|P_t\|_\infty, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.33}$$

as well as

$$\big\|P_t^{*k+1}\big\|_1 \leq \|P_t\|_1^{k+1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{4.34}$$

and hence, the convergence of the right-hand-side of (4.29) in L^1 and L^∞. A simple calculation shows, that (4.29) solves the Ornstein-Zernike equation.

To prove the second part of the claim we start by solving (4.31) and (4.32) for $q_0(\cdot, s)$ and $q_n(\cdot, s)$ respectively. From the proof of Theorem 2.1 we know, that there is a function $f \in L^1$ such that $(\delta_0 + s p_0(\cdot, s)) * (\delta_0 + s f) = \delta_0$. Hence the equations (4.31) and (4.32) are equivalent to

$$q_0(\cdot, s) = (\delta_0 + s f) * p_0(\cdot, s), \tag{4.35}$$

$$q_n(\cdot, s) = (\delta_0 + s f) * \left(p_n(\cdot, s) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_{n-k}(\cdot, s) * (p_{k-1}(\cdot, s) + s p_k(\cdot, s)) \right). \tag{4.36}$$

This implies that the q_n can be recursively determined.

In the next step we show the series in (4.30) converges. We fix s and write p_n for $p_n(\cdot, s)$ and q_n for $q_n(\cdot, s)$. We choose $p, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{\|p_n\|_1, \|p_n\|_\infty\} \leq p^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as well as $\max\{\|p_0\|_1, \|q_0\|_1, \|\delta_0 + s f\|_1\} \leq c$. This is possible due to Corollary 4.9 and Theorem 2.1. Moreover, we choose q such that $q > p$,

$$q > c(p + c^2 + scp) \tag{4.37}$$

and

$$c\left(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{2c}{q} + \frac{p}{q(q-p)} + \frac{scp}{q} + \frac{sp}{q-p} \right) \leq 1. \tag{4.38}$$

By (4.36) and (2.9) we have

$$\|q_1\|_1 = \|(\delta_0 + sf) * (p_1 - q_0 * p_0 - sq_0 * p_1)\|_1 \leq c(p + c^2 + scp) < q. \tag{4.39}$$

By induction over n we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|q_{n+1}\|_1 &= \left\| (\delta_0 + sf) * \left(p_{n+1} - \sum_{k=0}^{n} p_k * q_{n-k} - s \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} p_k * q_{n+1-k} \right) \right\|_1 \\
&\leq c \left(p^{n+1} + p^n c + cq^n + \frac{p^n q - pq^n}{p-q} + sp^{n+1} c + s \frac{p^{n+1} q - pq^{n+1}}{p-q} \right) \\
&= q^{n+1} c \left(\left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{n+1} + \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^n \frac{c}{q} + \frac{c}{q} + \frac{1}{q-p} \left(\left(\frac{p}{q} \right) - \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^n \right) + \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + sc \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{n+1} + s \frac{p}{q-p} \left(1 - \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^n \right) \right). \\
&\leq q^{n+1} c \left(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{2c}{q} + \frac{p}{q(q-p)} + \frac{scp}{q} + \frac{sp}{q-p} \right) \\
&\leq q^{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we use (2.8) instead of (2.9) we obtain the same bound for $\|q_n\|_\infty$ which implies the convergence of the sum in (4.30).

It remains to show, that the sum in (4.30) solves the Ornstein-Zernike equation. This is achieved by rewriting the Ornstein-Zernike equation in the form

$$P_t = Q_t + (t-s) P_t * Q_t + s P_t * Q_t. \tag{4.40}$$

Substituting for P_t and Q_t the series expansion at s yields that the equation holds, if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$p_n = q_n + \sum_{k=1}^{n} p_{k-1} * q_{n-k} + s \sum_{k=0}^{n} p_k * q_{n-k} \tag{4.41}$$

which is equivalent to (4.31) and (4.32). □

5 Combinatorics for small intensities

The coefficients p_n in (4.28) (given by (4.25)) are quite complex probabilistic objects. In the expansion of $P_t(x)$ around $s = 0$ however, η_s vanishes and the only random objects that remain are the random connections between the points $0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, x$. This leads to an almost combinatorial interpretation of the $p_n(x, 0)$ (In the Boolean model with a fixed gauge body all randomness disappears.) Moreover this interpretation provides a simple combinatorial way to determine the coefficients $q_n(x, 0)$ in (4.30).

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $\mathbb{G}_n$ be the set of connected graphs with $n + 2$ vertices $\{0, \ldots, n + 1\}$. For a graph $G = (V(G), E(G)) \in \mathbb{G}_n$ with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$ we call 0

the start-vertex and $n+1$ the end-vertex. For $i,j \in V(G)$ and $I \subset [n]$ we write "$i \leftrightarrow j$ in $G|I$" if there is a path from i to j in G that uses only vertices in $I \cup \{i,j\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we define the combinatorial functionals $\pi_n \colon \mathbb{G}_n \to \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\pi_n(G) := \sum_{I \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|I|} \mathbf{1}\{0 \leftrightarrow n+1 \text{ in } G|I\} \tag{5.1}$$

By a slight abuse of notation we write $G = \mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{x_0,\dots,x_{n+1}}\big)$ for $G \in \mathbb{G}_n$ if the two graphs are equal after changing the labels in G from i to x_i.

It was shown in Lemma 4.7 that the integrand in (4.25) vanishes if $\mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}\big)$ is not connected. Hence (4.25) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &p_n(x,s) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \int \mathbb{E} \sum_{G \in \mathbb{G}_n} \sum_{J \subset [n]} (-1)^{n-|J|} \mathbf{1}\big\{x \in C\big(0, \chi_0^{0,\mathbf{x},x}\big)\big\} \mathbf{1}\big\{\mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{0,\mathbf{x},x}\big) = G\big\}\, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \int \sum_{G \in \mathbb{G}_n} \pi_n(G) \mathbb{E}\mathbf{1}\big\{\mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{0,\mathbf{x},x}\big) = G\big\}\, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{G \in \mathbb{G}_n} \pi_n(G) I_n(G,x), \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where $I_n : \mathbb{G}_n \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I_n(G,x) &:= \int \mathbb{P}\big(\mathcal{G}\big(\chi_0^{0,\mathbf{x},x}\big) = G\big)\, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int \mathbb{E} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G)} \mathbf{1}\big\{\{x_i,x_j\} \in E\big(\chi_0^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}\big)\big\} \prod_{\{i,j\} \notin E(G)} \mathbf{1}\big\{\{x_i,x_j\} \notin E\big(\chi_0^{x_0,\mathbf{x},x_{n+1}}\big)\big\}\, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G)} \varphi(x_i - x_j) \prod_{\{i,j\} \notin E(G)} (1 - \varphi(x_i - x_j))\; d(x_1,\dots,x_n), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where again $x_0 := 0$ and $x_{n+1} := x$. By (5.2) we have found a representation of $p_n(x)$ as a sum over the graphs in $\mathbb{G}_n$ where each summand consists of a purely combinatorial factor and an integral-geometric factor. This representation looks rather natural, but is not well suited for the convolution. Therefore we will derive a second representation, that convolutes in a very simple way. This will also enable us, to give a very simple representation of the $q_n(x)$.

Let $J_n \colon \mathbb{G}_n \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$ be defined by

$$J_n(G,x) := \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G)} \varphi(x_i - x_j)\; d(x_1,\dots,x_n). \tag{5.4}$$

By multiplying the integrand with a $1 = \varphi(x_i - x_j) + (1 - \varphi(x_i - x_j))$ for each edge $\{i,j\}$ which is not contained in $E(G)$, we obtain that

$$J_n(G,x) = \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathbb{G}_n \\ E(H) \supset E(G)}} I_n(H,x). \tag{5.5}$$

For example

J_2  $= I_2$  $+ I_2$  $+ I_2$  $+ I_2$  .

By a Möbius-inversion (see e.g. [13]), we have

$$I_n(G,x) = \sum_{\substack{H\in\mathbb{G}_n \\ E(H)\supset E(G)}} (-1)^{|E(H)|-|E(G)|} J_n(H,x), \quad G \in \mathbb{G}_n. \tag{5.6}$$

This leads to the announced second representation for $p_n(x)$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(x) &= \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_n} \pi_n(G) I_n(G,x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_n}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{G}_n} \mathbf{1}\{E(H)\supset E(G)\}\pi_n(G)(-1)^{|E(H)|-|E(G)|} J_n(H,x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{G}_n} J_n(H,x) \sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_n} \mathbf{1}\{E(G)\subset E(H)\}\pi_n(G)(-1)^{|E(H)|-|E(G)|}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$p_n(x) = \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{G}_n} \kappa_n(H) J_n(H,x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$\kappa_n(H) := \sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_n} \mathbf{1}\{E(G)\subset E(H)\}\pi_n(G)(-1)^{|E(H)|-|E(G)|}. \tag{5.8}$$

A vertex $i \in [n]$ of a graph $G \in \mathbb{G}_n$ is called *pivotal*, if any path from 0 to $n+1$ contains i. The subset $\mathbb{G}_n^0 \subset \mathbb{G}_n$ of graphs which contain no pivotal vertex plays a significant role for determining the coefficients $q_n(x)$ from $p_n(x)$ as the next theorem shows.

Theorem 5.1. *The coefficients $q_n(x) := q_n(x,0)$ of the series representation of Q_t at $t_0 = 0$ satisfy*

$$q_n(x) = \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{G}_n^0} \kappa_n(H) J_n(H,x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This means, that $q_n(x)$ differs from $p_n(x)$ only by the sum over the graphs with pivotal vertices. The proof of Theorem 5.1 is based on some lemmas.

At first we define the concatenation of two graphs. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $G_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n$ and $G_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m$. The concatenation $G_1 \odot G_2 \in \mathbb{G}_{n+m+1}$ of G_1 and G_2 is constructed in the following way:

1. Relabel all nodes in G_2 with labels $\{n+1, \ldots, n+m+2\}$ without changing the order.

2. Define $V(G_1 \odot G_2) := V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$.

3. Define $E(G_1 \odot G_2) := E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$.

For example



(5.9)

In other words, we only combine the end-vertex of G_1 and the start-vertex of G_2 to a new vertex and adjust the labels.

Lemma 5.2. *For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $G_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n$, $G_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m$ we have*

$$\pi_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2) = \pi_n(G_1)\pi_m(G_2). \tag{5.10}$$

Proof: The vertex with label $n+1$ is by construction pivotal. If $0 \leftrightarrow n+m+2$ in $(G_1 \odot G_2)|I$, then $n+1 \in I$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2) &= \sum_{I \subset [n+m+1]} (-1)^{n+m+1-|I|} \mathbf{1}\{0 \leftrightarrow n+m+2 \text{ in } (G_1 \odot G_2)|I\} \\
&= \sum_{I_1 \subset [n]} \sum_{I_2 \subset [m]+n+1} (-1)^{n+m-|I_1|-|I_2|} \mathbf{1}\{0 \leftrightarrow n+1 \text{ in } (G_1 \odot G_2)|I_1\} \\
&\qquad \times \mathbf{1}\{n+1 \leftrightarrow n+m+2 \text{ in } (G_1 \odot G_2)|I_2\} \\
&= \sum_{I_1 \subset [n]} \sum_{I_2 \subset [m]} (-1)^{n+m-|I_1|-|I_2|} \mathbf{1}\{0 \leftrightarrow n+1 \text{ in } G_1|I_1\} \\
&\qquad \times \mathbf{1}\{0 \leftrightarrow m+1 \text{ in } G_2|I_2\} \\
&= \pi_n(G_1)\pi_m(G_2). \qquad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.3. *For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $G_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n$, $G_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m$ we have*

$$\kappa_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2) = \kappa_n(G_1)\kappa_m(G_2). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof: In every graph $H \in \mathbb{G}_{n+m+1}$ with $E(H) \subset E(G_1 \odot G_2)$ the vertex $n+1$ is pivotal. Hence there are uniquely determined Graphs $H_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n$ and $H_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m$ such that $H = H_1 \odot H_2$. The graph H_1 consists of 0, $n+1$ and all vertices lying "in front" of $n+1$, whereas H_2 is a relabeled version of the subgraph of H which consists of $n+1$, $n+m+2$

and all vertices lying "behind" $n+1$. Hence by Lemma 5.2

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2) \\
&\quad = \sum_{H \in \mathbb{G}_{n+m+1}} \mathbf{1}\{E(H) \subset E(G_1 \odot G_2)\} \pi_{n+m+1}(H) (-1)^{|E(H)|-|E(G_1 \odot G_2)|} \\
&\quad = \sum_{H_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n} \sum_{H_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m} \mathbf{1}\{E(H_1 \odot H_2) \subset E(G_1 \odot G_2)\} \pi_{n+m+1}(H_1 \odot H_2) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times (-1)^{|E(H_1 \odot H_2)|-|E(G_1 \odot G_2)|} \\
&\quad = \sum_{H_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n} \sum_{H_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m} \mathbf{1}\{E(H_1) \subset E(G_1)\} \mathbf{1}\{E(H_2) \subset E(G_2)\} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \pi_n(H_1) \pi_m(H_2) (-1)^{|E(H_1)|+|E(H_2)|-|E(G_1)|-|E(G_2)|} \\
&\quad = \kappa_n(G_1) \kappa_m(G_2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $G_1 \in \mathbb{G}_n$, $G_2 \in \mathbb{G}_m$ we have*

$$J_n(G_1) * J_m(G_2) = J_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2). \tag{5.12}$$

Proof: For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(J_n(G_1) * J_m(G_2))(x) = &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G_1)} \varphi(x_i - x_j) \; d(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \\
&\times \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^m} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G_2)} \varphi(y_i - y_j) \; d(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \; dx_{n+1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 := 0$ and $y_0 := 0$, $y_{m+1} := x - x_{n+1}$. By translation invariance, nothing changes, if we redefine $y_0 := x_{n+1}$ and $y_{m+1} := x$. If we apply Fubinis Theorem and rename the integration variables in the same way as we renamed the vertex labels in the definition of "concatenation" we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(J_n(G_1) * J_m(G_2))(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^m} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(G_1 \odot G_2)} \varphi(x_i - x_j) \; d(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \; d(x_{n+2}, \ldots, x_{n+m+1}) \; dx_{n+1} \\
&= J_{n+m+1}(G_1 \odot G_2)(x).
\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1: For $t_0 = 0$ equation (4.31) and (4.32) simplify to $q_0 = p_0$ and

$$q_{n+1} = p_{n+1} - \sum_{k=0}^{n} q_{n-k} * p_k, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{5.13}$$

We will use this for an induction over n. First we observe, that trivially $\mathbb{G}_0 = G_0^0$, as the graph G_0 that connects 0 and 1 with a single bond is the only element of $\mathbb{G}_0$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{0!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_0^0}\kappa_0(G)J_0(G,x) = J_0(G_0,x) = p_0 = q_0. \tag{5.14}$$

For the induction step we define $\mathbb{G}_n^{>0} := \mathbb{G}_n \setminus \mathbb{G}_n^0$. If follows from (5.7) that

$$p_{n+1} = \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_{n+1}^0}\kappa_{n+1}(G)J_{n+1}(G) + \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_{n+1}^{>0}}\kappa_{n+1}(G)J_{n+1}(G). \tag{5.15}$$

Hence by (5.13) it is enough to show

$$\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}_{n+1}^{>0}}\kappa_{n+1}(G)J_{n+1}(G) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} p_k * q_{n-k}. \tag{5.16}$$

We use the induction hypothesis, (5.7) and the Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{n} p_k * q_{n-k} \\
&\quad= \sum_{k=0}^{n}\left(\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{G_1\in\mathbb{G}_k}\kappa_k(G_1)J_k(G_1)\right) * \left(\frac{1}{(n-k)!}\sum_{G_2\in\mathbb{G}_{n-k}^0}\kappa_{n-k}(G_2)J_{n-k}(G_2)\right) \\
&\quad= \sum_{k=0}^{n}\frac{1}{k!(n-k)!}\sum_{G_1\in\mathbb{G}_k}\sum_{G_2\in\mathbb{G}_{n-k}^0}\kappa_{n+1}(G_1\odot G_2)J_{n+1}(G_1\odot G_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Finally we have a look at the left-hand side of (5.16). Let $G \in \mathbb{G}_{n+1}^0$. Each path from 0 to $n+2$ runs through the pivotal vertices of G in the same order. Let $v \in [n+1]$ be the last of these pivotal vertices. We define the set of graphs $\mathbb{H}_k \subset \mathbb{G}_{n+1}^0$, $k \in \{0,\dots,n\}$ with the following properties:

1. Each $H \in \mathbb{H}_k$ contains at least one pivotal vertex.
2. The vertex with label $k+1$ is the last pivotal vertex in each $H \in \mathbb{H}_k$.
3. The k vertices $\{1,\dots,k\}$ lie in front of the vertex $k+1$.
4. The $n-k$ vertices $\{k+2,\dots,n+1\}$ lie behind the vertex $k+1$.

We partition the set $[n+1]$ of vertices in each $G \in \mathbb{G}_{n+1}^0$ into three sets M_1, M_2 and M_3. The set M_1 contains all vertices that lie in front of the last pivotal vertex of G. The set M_2 contains only the last pivotal vertex and M_3 contains the remaining vertices. Now we relabel the vertices in G to obtain a graph $\tilde{G}$ in the following way: The vertices in M_1 are labeled with the numbers $1,\dots,|M_1|$ without changing the order. The vertex in M_2 is labeled $|M_1|+1$ and the vertices in M_3 are labeled with the numbers $|M_1|+2,\dots,n+1$, again without changing the order. By construction we have $\tilde{G} \in \mathbb{H}_{|M|_1}$ but $\kappa(G) = \kappa(\tilde{G})$

and $J_{n+1}(G) = J_{n+1}(\tilde{G})$. There are exactly $\binom{n+1}{k,n-k,1}$ Graphs in $\mathbb{G}^0_{n+1}$, which become the same $\tilde{G}$ by this relabeling procedure. Hence we have for the left-hand side of (5.16)

$$\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\sum_{G\in\mathbb{G}^{>0}_{n+1}}\kappa_{n+1}(G)J_{n+1}(G) = \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{H}_k}\binom{n+1}{k,n-k,1}\kappa_{n+1}(H)J_{n+1}(H)$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{n}\sum_{H\in\mathbb{H}_k}\frac{1}{k!(n-k)!}\kappa_{n+1}(H)J_{n+1}(H)$$

which is equal to (5.17) due to the definition of the concatenation. □

6 Appendix: Palm distributions

In this paper all random elements are defined on a measurable space $(\Omega,\mathcal{A})$ equipped with a *measurable flow* $\theta_x\colon \Omega\to\Omega$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$. This is a family of measurable mappings such that $(\omega,x)\mapsto\theta_x\omega$ is measurable, θ_0 is the identity on Ω and

$$\theta_x\circ\theta_y = \theta_{x+y},\quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\circ$ denotes composition. We may think of $\theta_x\omega$ as of ω *shifted* by the vector $-x$. We fix a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega,\mathcal{A})$ and assume that it is *stationary*, that is

$$\mathbb{P}\circ\theta_x = \mathbb{P},\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

where θ_x is interpreted as a mapping from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ in the usual way:

$$\theta_x A := \{\theta_x\omega : \omega\in A\},\quad A\in\mathcal{A},\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the space of all locally finite subsets μ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Hence $\mu\in\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ iff $\mu\cap B$ is finite for each bounded set. For each $\mu\in\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and each $B\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\mu(B) := |\mu\cap B|$ for the number of points of μ lying in B. As usual we equip $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the smallest σ-field $\mathcal{N}$ making the mappings $\mu\mapsto\mu(B)$ measurable for all B in the Borel σ-field $\mathcal{B}^d$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

A *point process* on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a measurable mapping $\eta\colon\Omega\to\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is called *invariant* (or *stationary*)

$$\eta(\omega,B+x) = \eta(\theta_x\omega,B),\quad \omega\in\Omega, x\in\mathbb{R}^d, B\in\mathcal{B}^d. \tag{6.2}$$

Let η be an invariant point process. The *intensity* of η is the number $\gamma_\eta := \mathbb{E}\eta([0,1]^d)$. If the latter is positive and finite we can define the probability measure

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\eta(A) := \gamma_\eta^{-1}\int\sum_{x\in\eta(\omega)}\mathbf{1}\{\theta_x\omega\in A, x\in[0,1]^d\}\,\mathbb{P}(d\omega),\quad A\in\mathcal{A}. \tag{6.3}$$

This *Palm probability measure* of η satisfies the *refined Campbell formula*

$$\int\sum_{x\in\eta(\omega)} f(\theta_x\omega,x)\,\mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \gamma_\eta\iint f(\omega,x)\,dx\,\mathbb{P}^0_\eta(d\omega) \tag{6.4}$$

for all measurable $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$, where dx refers to integration with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Using standard conventions we write this as

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{x\in\eta} f(\theta_x, x) = \gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}_\eta^0 \int f(\theta_0, x)\, dx, \tag{6.5}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\eta^0$ denote integration with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0$. The measure $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0$ is concentrated on the measurable set Ω_0 of all $\omega \in \Omega$ such that the origin 0 is in $\eta(\omega)$. The *Palm distribution* of η is the distribution $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0(\eta \in \cdot)$ of η under $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0$. It is concentrated on the measurable set of all $\mu \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \in \mu$. The number $\mathbb{P}_\eta^0(A)$ can be interpreted as the conditional probability of $A \in \mathcal{A}$ given that η has a point at the origin.

The following result (Neveu's exchange formula) is a versatile tool of Palm theory.

Proposition 6.1. *Let η, η' be two invariant point processes with finite intensities and let $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$ be measurable. Then*

$$\gamma_\eta\, \mathbb{E}_\eta^0 \sum_{x\in\eta'} f(\theta_0, x) = \gamma_{\eta'}\, \mathbb{E}_{\eta'}^0 \sum_{x\in\eta} f(\theta_x, -x). \tag{6.6}$$

This remains true for any measurable $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{E}_{\eta'}^0 \int |f(\theta_x, -x)|\, \eta(dx) < \infty$.

Let η be a point process on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The n-th *factorial moment measure* $\alpha^{(n)}$ of η is the measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$, defined by

$$\alpha^{(n)} := \mathbb{E} \sum_{x_1,\dots,x_n\in\eta}^{\neq} \mathbf{1}\{(x_1,\dots,x_n) \in \cdot\}, \tag{6.7}$$

where $\sum^{\neq}$ denotes summation over all ordered n-tuples of distinct elements of η. Assume now that η is an invariant point process with a positive and finite intensity. Assume also that $\alpha^{(2)}$ is locally finite (finite on bounded Borel sets) and absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, that is (using also stationarity)

$$\alpha^{(2)}(d(x,y)) = \gamma_\eta^2 \rho(y-x)\, d(x,y) \tag{6.8}$$

for a locally integrable measurable $\rho\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. The latter is the *pair correlation function* of η. The *two-point Palm probability measures* of η is a family $\{\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y} : x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ of probability measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ such that $(x,y) \mapsto \mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(A)$ is measurable for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{x,y\in\eta}^{\neq} f(\theta_0, x, y) = \gamma_\eta^2 \int \mathbb{E}_\eta^{x,y} f(\theta_0, x, y) \rho(y-x)\, d(x,y) \tag{6.9}$$

for all measurable $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,\infty)$, where $\mathbb{E}_\eta^{x,y}$ denotes expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}$. These Palm distributions can be constructed as follows. An easy calculation shows that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}^d$

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 \sum_{x\in\eta\setminus\{0\}} \mathbf{1}\{x \in B\} = \gamma_\eta^2 \int \mathbf{1}\{x \in B\} \rho(x)\, dx.$$

We now assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ is a *Borel space*. This very weak assumption can be made without restricting generality. By a standard disintegration technique we can then find a family $\{\mathbb{P}_\eta^{0,x} : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ of probability measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^0 \int f(\theta_0, x)\, \eta(dx) = \mathbb{E}_\eta^0 f(\theta_0, 0) + \gamma_\eta \int \mathbb{E}_\eta^{0,x} f(\theta_0, x)\rho(x)\, dx \tag{6.10}$$

for all measurable $f\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$. We can then define

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(A) := \mathbb{P}^{0,y-x}(\theta_x A), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

This means that

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta^{x,y} F = \mathbb{E}_\eta^{0,y-x} F \circ \theta_{-x}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{6.11}$$

for all measurable $F\colon \Omega \to [0, \infty)$. Using the refined Campbell theorem (6.4) and (6.10) it is then not hard to check that (6.9) holds. It is also easy to see that $\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(x, y \in \eta) = 1$ for $\alpha^{(2)}$-a.e. $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. The number $\mathbb{P}_\eta^{x,y}(A)$ can be interpreted as probability of $A \in \mathcal{A}$ given that η has points at x and y.

Let us now assume that $\eta \equiv \eta_t$ is a stationary Poisson process of intensity $t > 0$. The multivariate Mecke equation (see e.g. [15, Corollary 3.2.3] or [8, Theorem 4.4]) states for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any measurable function $f\colon \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \to [0, \infty)$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \eta}^{\neq} f(\eta_t, x_1, \ldots, x_n) = t^n \int \mathbb{E} f\big(\eta_t \cup \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}, x_1, \ldots, x_n\big)\, d(x_1, \ldots, x_n). \tag{6.12}$$

The case $n = 1$ easily implies (together with stationarity of η_t) that the Palm distribution of η_t is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^0(\eta_t \in \cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\eta_t \cup \{0\} \in \cdot).$$

For $n = 2$ we obtain from (6.12) that the pair correlation function ρ_t of η_t satisfies $\rho_t \equiv 1$ and that, moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}^{x,y}(\eta_t \in \cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\eta_t \cup \{x, y\} \in \cdot)$$

for almost every (x, y) with respect to Lebesgue measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^2$.

In this paper we work also with point processes on a metric space $\mathbb{X}$ different from $\mathbb{R}^d$. These are a random elements of the space $\mathbf{N}(\mathbb{X})$ of all integer-valued locally finite measures μ on $\mathbb{X}$ equipped with the smallest σ-field making the mappings $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ measurable for all B in the Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{X}$. For more details on point processes we refer to [8, 15]. A survey of Palm theory can be found in [6].

Acknowledgments: We wish to thank Salvatore Torquato for drawing our attention to the Ornstein-Zernike equation and its relevance for percolation theory. This work was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the research unit "Geometry and Physics of Spatial Random System" under the grant LA 965/7-2.

References

[1] Baxter, R. J. (1970). Ornstein-Zernike relation and Percus-Yevick approximation for fluid mixtures. *J. Chem. Phys.* **52**, 4559-4562.

[2] Coniglio, A., De Angelis, U. and Forlani, A. (1977). Pair connectedness and cluster size. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **10**, 1123-1139.

[3] Grimmett, G. (1999). *Percolation*. Second Edition, Springer, Berlin.

[4] Hall, P. (1988). *Introduction to the Theory of Coverage Processes*. Wiley, New York.

[5] Jörgens, K. (1970). *Lineare Integraloperatoren.* Teubner, Stuttgart.

[6] Last, G. (2010). Modern random measures: Palm theory and related models. In: *New Perspectives in Stochastic Geometry* (W. Kendall und I. Molchanov, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010.

[7] Last, G. (2014). Perturbation analysis of Poisson processes. *Bernoulli* **20**, 486-513.

[8] Last, G. and Penrose, M.D. (2016). Lectures on the Poisson Process. To be published by Cambridge University Press. Available at `http://www.math.kit.edu/stoch/~last/page/lehrbuch_poissonp/en`

[9] Meester, R. and Roy, R. (1996). *Continuum Percolation.* Cambridge University Press.

[10] Molchanov, I. and Zuyev, S (2000). Variational analysis of functionals of Poisson processes. *Math. Operat. Res.* **25**, 485-508.

[11] Otter, R. (1949). The multiplicative process. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **20**, 206-224.

[12] Ornstein, L.S. and Zernike, F. (1914). Accidental deviations of density and opalescence at the critical point of a single substance. *Proc. Akad. Sci.* (Amsterdam), **17**.

[13] Peccati, G., and Taqqu, M. (2011). *Wiener Chaos: Moments, Cumulants and Diagrams: A Survey with Computer Implementation.* Springer, Milan.

[14] Penrose, M. (2003). *Random Geometric Graphs*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

[15] Schneider, R. and Weil, W. (2008). *Stochastic and Integral Geometry.* Springer, Berlin.

[16] Torquato, S. (2002). *Random Heterogeneous Materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Properties.* Springer, New York.

[17] Torquato, S. (2012). Effect of dimensionality on the continuum percolation of overlapping hyperspheres and hypercubes. *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 054106.